

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ATTORNEYS

8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
Bus: (713) 468-8880
Fax: (713) 468-8883

Official
RECEIVED
FAC
2/27/03

Fax

To:	Examiner Tan V. Mai	From:	Fred G. Pruner, Jr.
Company:	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	Date:	February 27, 2003
Fax:	703-746-7238	Pages:	4
Serial No.:	09/432,337	Our Re:	ITL0277US (P7626)

Urgent **For Review** **Please Comment** **Please Reply** **Confirm Receipt**

MESSAGE:

● **Notice:** This information is intended to be for the use of the individual or entity named on this transmittal sheet. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the contents of this faxed information is prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please notify the sender by telephone immediately so that arrangements can be made for the retrieval of the original document at no cost to you.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant: Tinku Acharya § Art Unit: 2124
 Serial No.: 09/432,337 §
 Filed: November 2, 1999 § Examiner: Tan V. Mai
 Title: Discrete Filter Having a § Docket No. ITL.0277US
 Tap Selection Circuit § (P7626)

Box AF
 Commissioner for Patents
 Washington, DC 20231

REPLY TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION DATED FEBRUARY 21, 2003

Dear Sir:

In an Office Action mailed on February 21, 2003, claims 1-3 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lesthievent; and claims 4-8 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form. The remaining rejections are discussed below.

The digital signal processing circuit of independent claim 1 includes a tap selection circuit, a circuit that is not shown in Lesthievent. The Examiner acknowledges this point, as in the latest Office Action, the Examiner states, "it is noted that Lesthievent et al do not show the claimed 'tap selection circuit'." Final Office Action, 2. However, the Examiner goes on to state that Lesthievent teaches a circuit to allegedly perform the function of the tap selection circuit that is recited in lines 4 and 5 of claim 1. Thus, the Examiner concludes a case of obviousness for claim 1 because, "the switches s(i) are capable of providing the equivalent function, i.e., select a group of processing units having multipliers g(i)." *Id.*, 2.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Furthermore, "all words in a claim must

Date of Deposit: <u>2/27/03</u>
I certify that this document and authorization to charge deposit account is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. 703/746-7238) on the date indicated above.
<u>Debra Currona</u>